

**REMARKS**

Claims 6-13 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 6-9 and 11-13 are amended. Claim 5 is canceled.

**I. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 5, 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,969,745 to Blocker in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,494,688 to Hatada et al. (hereinafter "Hatada").

The Office Action asserts that Blocker teaches a method to manufacture a semiconductor device, comprising preparing a semiconductor wafer including a chip forming section having an electrode (Fig. 3, 10a); forming a first through hole in the electrode (Fig. 3, 10e; col. 3, lines 42-46); forming a second through hole penetrating the semiconductor wafer and coaxial to the first through hole, the second through hole communicating with the first through hole (Fig. 3, 13); and forming a conduction layer (Fig. 3, 10) that extends via the first and second through holes from a first surface of the semiconductor chip forming section on which the electrode is formed to a second surface opposite the first surface, the conduction layer being electrically connected to the electrode (Fig. 3). The Office Action acknowledges that Blocker does not teach preparing a semiconductor wafer including a plurality of semiconductor chip forming sections each having an electrode.

The Office Action goes on to assert that Hatada teaches that it is known to prepare a semiconductor wafer including a plurality of semiconductor chip forming sections, each having an electrode in the pursuit of miniaturization of integrated circuits (col. 1, lines 12-18). The Office Action thus asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to manufacture a semiconductor device according to the method taught by Blocker and further fabricated a plurality of such devices, each of its own semiconductor chip

forming section with an electrode, as taught by Hatada, is common in the semiconductor device processing arts.

The Applicant hereby cancels independent claim 5. Therefore, the rejection of independent claim 5 is made moot by this Amendment. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn. Dependent claims 6 and 8 have been amended to be dependent on currently amended independent claim 9. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**II. Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 9-11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Claims 9-11 have been amended as recommended by the Office Action. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the objection to claims 9-11, be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 6, 7, 8, 12 and 13 have been amended to be dependent on claim 9. Based on the discussion above, it is believed that independent claim 9 is in condition for allowance. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that claims 6, 7, 8 and 13 being dependent on independent claim 9, are also in condition for allowance.

**III. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 6-13 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Eric D. Morehouse  
Registration No. 38,565

JAO:EDM/mdw

Date: November 10, 2005

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--